REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the final Office Action of January 6, 2009 in which claims 1-33 were rejected. New claims 34-38 have been added by the above amendment.

In the Advisory Action of April 6, 2009, the Examiner considers that *Friesen* and *Tendler* teach using inductive coupling for conveying a GPS signal.

However, the Applicants respectfully disagree for the following reasons.

In his reasoning, the Examiner considers that *Friesen* teaches inductive coupling.

Friesen describes a cradle which may have a direct RF connection to a handset or it may be inductively coupled (see column 4, lines 39 to 41). In *Friesen*, received signals can include either analog or digital voice communication signals (see column 5, lines 2 to 4).

Thus, *Friesen* mentions inductive coupling but does not describe inductive coupling for conveying a signal carrying a digital broadcast, such as a GPS signal.

As will be explained below, although *Tendler* mentions a GPS signal, the skilled person would not consider modifying the cellular telephone antenna, booster amplifier and cradle of *Friesen* so as to receive GPS signals.

In his reasoning, the Examiner considers that *Tendler* teaches inductively coupling for conveying a GPS signal (see phrase bridging pages 2 and 3).

Again, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Tendler merely describes a passive transfer antenna to couple relatively weak GPS signals from an active GPS antenna mounted outside a car to an internally carried GPS antenna in a phone (see paragraph [0010]). The transfer antenna is in close proximity to the GPS antenna in the phone (see paragraph [0026]).

Thus, *Tendler* does not teach or even suggest inductive coupling.

Therefore, Applicants consider that neither *Friesen* nor *Tendler* describe inductive coupling for conveying a GPS signal. Furthermore, neither reference clearly and unambiguously describes a loop or coil configured to couple inductively with a corresponding loop or coil included in a mobile terminal as specified in claim 1.

Moreover, even if *Friesen* and *Tendler* are combined, Applicants consider that the person of ordinary skill in the art would not modify *Friesen* in view of *Tendler* so as to provide inductive coupling for conveying a GPS signal.

As explained in Applicants' previous response, this is because *Tendler* teaches providing a separate cellular phone antenna and a separate GPS antenna (see paragraph [0026]). Thus, the person of ordinary skill in the art would not consider modifying the cellular telephone antenna, booster amplifier and cradle of *Friesen* so as to receive GPS signals.

In fact, Applicants maintain that the person of ordinary skill in the art would not modify *Friesen* in view of *Tendler* because they would foresee that the system of *Friesen* may introduce timing errors and/or interference affecting reception of GPS signals.

Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's reasoning, Applicants consider that *Friesen* and *Tendler*, either alone or in combination, do not teach inductive coupling for conveying a GPS signal.

In any case, as explained in Applicants' previous response, Applicants consider that the person of ordinary skill in the art would not consider combining *Friesen*, *Tendler* and *Hwangbo* so as to arrive at a device as claimed in claim 1.

This is because the references are concerned with completely different problems and describe very different systems from one another. *Hwangbo* is concerned with providing a set-top box system for viewing different digital broadcast programs (see paragraph [0008]) whereas *Friesen* concerns providing a booster amplifier that enhances the performance of a cellular telephone while operating a motor vehicle (see column 3, lines 14 to 16).

For these reasons Applicants consider that claim 1 is not obvious.

Applicants consider that claims 18 and 22 are not obvious for the same reasons as claim 1 and that claims 2 to 17, 19 to 21 and 23 to 33 are not obvious at least by way of dependency.

Applicants consider that claim 3 is not obvious for the additional reason that none of the prior art documents teach an amplifier adapted to be powered by a mobile terminal. For example, *Friesen* merely describes signals generated by a handset and cradle following a path through a transmit side of a booster amplifier

(see column 5, lines 7 and 8) and, thus, does not describe an amplifier adapted to be powered by a mobile terminal.

Applicants consider that claim 4 is not obvious for the additional reason that none of the prior art documents teach an amplifier adapted to be controlled by a mobile terminal. For example, *Friesen* merely describes a gain controller which detects the maximum input power to a booster amplifier from a handset and dynamically adjusts a variable gain element (see column 6, lines 14 to 16). In other words, in *Friesen*, the amplifier detects the power of transmissions from a handset, but is not adapted to be controlled by a mobile terminal as specified in claim 4. The same arguments also apply to claim 5.

Applicants consider that claim 6 is not obvious for the additional reason that none of the prior art documents teach a detector adapted to determine a position of a mobile terminal and a controller adapted to control operation of an amplifier in dependence upon the position of the mobile terminal. For example, *Friesen* merely describes detecting input power from a handset and so does not describe determining a position of a mobile terminal (see column 6, lines 14 and 15). *Tendler* merely describes a cellular phone with a GPS receiver (see Figure 1) and so does not describe a device, such as a desk stand, as specified in claim 6. The same arguments also apply to claims 7 to 11.

Applicants consider that claim 12 is not obvious for the additional reason that none of the prior art documents teach a filter adapted to obtain a signal from at least one other signal. For example, *Friesen* merely describes a booster amplifier comprising various components (see Figure 1), none of which is a filter as specified in claim 12.

Applicants consider that claim 14 is not obvious for the additional reason that none of the prior art documents teach a loop arranged substantially around a perimeter of a face of a device. For example, *Friesen* merely describes that that the cradle may have a direct RF connection to the handset or it may be inductively coupled (see 4, lines 39 to 41) and, thus, does not clearly and unambiguously describe a loop, let alone a specific arrangement of a loop.

Applicants consider that claim 15 is not obvious for the additional reason that none of the prior art documents teach that a loop or coil has an area of between

10 and 50 cm^2. For example, as explained above, *Friesen* does not describe a specific arrangement of a loop.

Withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 1-33 is requested.

The objections and rejections of the Office Action of January 6, 2009, having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, withdrawal thereof is requested and passage of claims 1-33 to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Francis Maguire

Francis J. Maguire
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 31,391

FJM/mo
WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, Connecticut 06468
(203) 261-1234